

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume IX, Issue No. 5

November 2003

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

Terrorism and Tyranny: Trampling Freedom, Justice and Peace to Rid the World of Evil

By James Bovard

The Homeland Security Department has advised Americans to be wary of people who become impatient while waiting in line to pay for groceries, people who recently might have shaved off a beard, and people whose faces show no emotion but whose eyes appear to be focused and alert.

In U.S. airports, meanwhile, flight schedules are being disrupted by women wearing something called an underwire bra, which routinely sets off the metal detectors. Typically, these women are not terrorists but become unreasonably hostile when guards undertake to "pat them down" to ascertain whether the so-called underwire bra is in fact a concealed weapon.

The gallows humor of James Bovard, a bright fellow with a sharp wit, helps to underscore the more outrageous blunders and miscalculations that have been committed by the several intelligence communities and law-enforcement agencies, the opportunistic power grabs by high-ranking bureaucrats, and the heavy damage inflicted on the Bill of Rights not by terrorists, but by friendly fire from both the Justice Department and the White House, all under the banner of defending freedom. Bovard finds much that he considers ridiculous and he does not shrink from ridiculing it.

The most conspicuous example, in his view, is the centerpiece of the new maximum-security America, the USA-PATRIOT Act. The letters stand for "Uniting and Strengthening

America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism," and the acronym "PATRIOT" was chosen presumably to suggest that true loyalists shouldn't quibble over the assortment of rights and freedoms that would have to be dumped into the Potomac in order to equip the government with the tools it deems "appropriate," which turns out to mean: largely unencumbered by constitutional restraints.

Bovard argues that expanded powers amount to a reward for incompetence and misconduct on the part of federal agents who failed, with tragic results, to uncover and prevent the 9/11 plot. This is of central importance in Bovard's analysis of the response to 9/11 --- the fact, which has been affirmed by the Joint Intelligence Committee, that the government had all of the information it needed to detect and block a conspiracy to hijack four airliners. Some of the information was lost, Bovard says, and the rest, which was in Arabic, was put into storage to await the arrival at some future time of a translator. In any event, he says, after the government failed to analyze and exploit the information in its possession, it granted itself the right to seize vastly more information and to treat all Americans as if they were collaborating with the terrorists.

A case in point is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), passed by Congress in 1978. It established a less demanding legal standard of probable cause --- diluting probability to the realm of possibility -- for spying on foreign agents within the United States and a separate court (FISC) to oversee that surveillance. At Ashcroft's urging, the Patriot Act extended FISA's authority to include

surveillance of American citizens, effectively bypassing the Fourth Amendment.

As a libertarian, Bovard objects strongly to the act's broad powers, which breach fundamental provisions of the judicial system, particularly those dealing with privacy, presumption of innocence, due process and judicial review. At the same time, he cannot resist pointing out the irony of the President's repeated assertion that the nation is "fighting for freedom," when the government itself --- notably the Attorney General --- has made clear that the Constitution only impedes the fight.

Under the aegis of the Patriot Act, foreign nationals may be held in custody for indefinite periods without access to legal counsel. FBI agents may now walk into a bookstore or library and demand records of books purchased, checked out or simply asked about -- highly invasive violations of privacy that had been strictly prohibited before passage of the Patriot Act.

Bovard is deeply concerned by the expanded federal surveillance under which Americans now live their daily lives. Old rules are no longer relevant when the FBI turns on its DCS 1000 email wiretapping system, which is capable of scanning and collecting millions of emails per second, filtered or not. Because Americans may as easily be terrorists as anyone else, every American is potentially guilty and therefore to be regarded as a suspect, if only in some not-yet-committed crime. To obtain an even closer look, the FBI uses software called "Magic Lantern," which enables it to monitor and record all keystrokes on targeted computers. The Patriot Act also permits "national roving wiretaps" of telephones not limited to persons who have in some

way aroused more suspicion than the average U.S. citizen, but covering large geographical segments of the population.

Yet another tool is the National Security Letter, a subpoena letter issued without a court order that compels the recipient -- an individual, business, organization or institution -- to surrender all confidential or proprietary information, including records of bank accounts, Internet usage, phone calls, email logs, lists of purchases, and so on. Persons receiving such letters are prohibited from telling anyone. Disclosure carries a penalty of up to five years in prison.

The government's reasoning is that in the post 9/11 context the Fourth Amendment prohibition of unreasonable searches must be reinterpreted. What is deemed unreasonable in time of peace, Ashcroft argues, shouldn't necessarily be viewed as unreasonable at a time when America still faces the threat of further attacks.

Bovard accepts the argument but not the extent to which its conclusion has been used to justify essentially unrestricted spying on U.S. citizens. In any event, he says, allowing the government to nullify constitutional rights in defending the country against terrorism isn't the correct response to the terrorist threat because it fails to address the cause, which he says is U.S. meddling in the affairs of foreign governments.

Unable to display concrete evidence that America is bringing terrorism to its knees, Bovard says, the various governmental news providers have begun to rely on numbers as indicators of progress, in the same way that enemy body counts became integral to reports issued during the Vietnam War to persuade the public that U.S. forces were making headway. Now the FBI or the President announces triumphantly how many wiretaps and searches have been carried out, how many persons of "special interest" have been detained, how many bank accounts have been frozen, and how much money was in all of those accounts. Of course, the enemy body counts turned out to be largely irrelevant, as were figures on wiretaps, detainees and frozen bank accounts, without additional information such as how many of the persons whose phones were tapped turned out to have terrorist links. As it is, Americans can only speculate as to whether the numbers signify success or simply activity.

Bovard's position is firmly established on a foundation of classical liberalism and libertarianism to which he is deeply committed, and he is profoundly troubled by some of the measures taken by the Bush administration to secure the nation against terrorist attack. ***Yet the chief value of this book rests on the author's reporting, not on argument or interpretation. He has fully answered a good reporter's basic question: "What are the facts?" His sources are credible and his presentation, except for an occasional sarcastic comment, is objective and straightforward. Every item of information is properly declared and accounted for in 68 pages of endnotes.***

One may disagree with his conclusions -- that the price exacted by the federal government for enhanced security is exorbitantly and unreasonably high, that the government has trashed principles that defined this nation and made it unique, and that what has been taken away might never be fully restored.

Reaching the closing pages, readers may recall a much-quoted statement made at a news conference years ago in Saigon. Explaining to correspondents why a particular South Vietnamese village was no more, a military spokesman said simply, "We had to destroy it in order to save it."

-- Reviewed by Harold V. Cordry

"Let's Raise My Pay"

By Paul Jacob

Every year Congress sits back and allows itself to automatically accept an "automatic" pay raise. The mechanism is the COLA, or Cost of Living Adjustment.

Now senators will be getting \$158,000 a year, an increase of more than \$3,000.

The increase is "automatic." But thanks to a few renegade colleagues the congressmen do have to show their colors each year anyway. This time the Senate had to vote 60-34 to reject a proposal to exempt senators from the COLA. And there were the usual incomprehensible rationales.

Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, a Republican, says, "I think that our representatives of government deserve a pay raise consistent with the work that we've produced." Frist can't mean that, not really. I would be happy to take him up on it but that means the congressmen owe the U.S. taxpayers

something like 4 trillion dollars.

Then there's Ted Stevens, the Republican who chairs the Senate Appropriations Committee, which is the central nexus of pork distribution. "This is not a pay raise," stipulates Stevens. "This is an increase that's required by law."

Uh, sir. It isn't required if you vote it down, is it? And who do you think is making U.S. federal law anyway? It's not the lawmaking body on Mars.

"A Good German, Following Orders"

By Pastor Chuck Baldwin

An October 28 report in *Insight* magazine reminded us that the Democratic presidential candidate and retired four-star general, Wesley Clark, was the Army commander who used U.S. soldiers and military hardware against American civilians in the federal assault against the Branch Davidians which violated the Posse Comitatus Act and resulted in the massacre of nearly ninety lives, including old men, women, and children.

To be sure, General Clark possesses a plethora of great distinctions. He graduated first in his class at West Point. He was a Rhodes scholar, a decorated Vietnam combat veteran, a White House fellow, and Supreme Commander of NATO. However, his role at the disastrous assault of the Branch Davidians outside Waco, Texas, leaves many questions about his fitness to be entrusted with America's civil liberties.

According to *Insight*, "Between August 1992 and April 1994, Clark was commander of the 1st Cavalry Division of the Army's III Corps at Fort Hood, Texas. According to a report by the U.S. Department of the Treasury, military personnel and equipment used at Waco included: 15 active-duty military personnel, 13 Texas National Guard personnel, nine Bradley fighting vehicles, five combat-engineer vehicles, one tank-retrieval vehicle and two M1A1 Abrams tanks. Additionally, Fort Hood reportedly was used for much of the training for the bloody attack on the Davidians and their children."

The report quotes West Point graduate Joseph Mehrten Jr. as saying, "It is of critical importance that such vehicles could not have been moved for use at Waco without Clark's knowledge."

Many will excuse Clark's decision to use military personnel and hardware against American civilians as

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. -- Mark Twain

being justified by saying, "He was only following orders." Mehrten's response to that argument is, "To follow that order is to follow a blatantly illegal order of a kind every West Point officer knows is a violation of the Posse Comitatus Act. Clark's obligation was to say, 'No, I'm not going to do it.'"

Mehrten continues, "Look, Clark went to the same institution I did and at West Point we had extensive instruction in military ethics and issues concerning how one avoids obeying an illegal military order. It is drilled into our heads from the earliest days as cadets that the 'I-was-just-following-orders' defense isn't necessarily a good one."

Before people elect Wesley Clark as their president, these issues need to be resolved. Why did General Clark allow U.S. military forces, including armored vehicles and tanks to be used in a massacre of American civilians? Who gave him such an order? Was it then-governor of Texas Ann Richards? Was it Janet Reno or Bill Clinton?

Other questions Clark needs to answer are: What is his understanding of the Posse Comitatus Act? Does he believe it is proper for military forces to be used against American citizens? Would he ever authorize such action?

To date, General Clark has never been called upon to answer these questions. He wasn't even asked to testify before the congressional committee investigating the circumstances at Waco. The American people need to hear his answers to these questions!

The Waco tragedy still haunts the American conscience. That nearly ninety Americans, most of whom were old people, women, and children, could be mercilessly gunned down or burned alive at the hands of U.S. military personnel and federal agents eats like a cancer at our nation's character! That General Clark may have participated in both the act and the resultant cover-up is very serious!

Michael McNulty, an investigative journalist and Oscar nominee for his documentary, "Waco: The Rules of Engagement," said, "Whatever he (General Clark) did, he at least is guilty of being a good German, following orders."

However, with the federal government's fascination with continued infringements upon the American people's rights and liberties, the last thing we need is a "good German" for president!

-- NewsWithViews.com, November 11, 2003. Dr. Baldwin is the host of a radio talk show on the Genesis

Communications Network called, "Chuck Baldwin Live" Pastor Baldwin writes weekly articles on the internet <http://www.ChuckBaldwinLive.com>

Military Advice

"Aim towards the Enemy." - Instruction printed on US Rocket Launcher

"When the pin is pulled, Mr. Grenade is not our friend." - US Army

"If the enemy is in range, so are you." - *Infantry Journal*

"A slipping gear could let your M203 grenade launcher fire when you least expect it. That would make you quite unpopular in what's left of your unit." - *PM*, Army's magazine of preventive maintenance.

"It is generally inadvisable to eject directly over the area you just bombed." - US Air Force Manual

"Try to look unimportant; they may be low on ammo." - *Infantry Journal*

"Tracers work both ways." - US Army Ordnance

"Five-second fuses only last three seconds." - *Infantry Journal*

"Bravery is being the only one who knows you're afraid." - Col. David Hackworth

"If your attack is going too well, you're probably walking into an ambush." - *Infantry Journal*

"No combat-ready unit has ever passed inspection." - Joe Gay

"Any ship can be a minesweeper ... once." - Anon

"Never tell the Platoon Sergeant you have nothing to do." - Unknown Army Recruit

"Don't draw fire; it irritates the people around you." - Your Buddies

And lastly....

"If you see a bomb technician running, try to keep up with him." - USA Ammo Troop

The Right to Keep and Bear Arms Act of 2003 (H.R. 3125)

According to H.R. 3125, Congress finds that:

1. over the past decade, the United Nations has demonstrated a consistent animus to the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and to the right to keep and bear arms;

2. in June 2003, the United Nations sponsored a "Week of Action Against Small Arms";

3. French President Jacques Chirac and the socialist president of Brazil Luiz Lula da Silva both advocate the imposition of a United Nations' tax on firearms for various utopian purposes;

4. two million largely unarmed people are killed yearly by oppressive genocidal governments throughout the world; and

5. ironically, at the same time the United Nations was working to prohibit Americans from exercising their Second Amendment rights to defend themselves, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms was called to investigate the illegal possession of submachine by bodyguards to Secretary General of the United Nations Kofi Annan.

H.R. 3125 would prohibit U.S. taxpayer dollars from being used to support or promote any United Nations' actions that could in any way infringe on the Second Amendment. The legislation also expresses the sense of Congress that proposals to tax, or otherwise limit, the right to keep and bear arms are "reprehensible and deserving of condemnation."

H.R. 3125 was introduced by Rep. Ron Paul on September 17, 2003 with ten cosponsors. Urge your U.S. representative to defend America's Second Amendment by cosponsoring H.R. 3125.

-- <http://capwiz.com/liberty/issues/bills/?bill=3560191>

"Administrative Subpoenas"

WASHINGTON (AP) - The Bush administration wants a subpoena power that does not require federal investigators to seek approval from a judge or grand jury.

Justice Department officials say use of "**administrative subpoenas**" would enable the FBI to obtain information that might prevent a terror strike more quickly from records or witnesses. Critics say the extension of power is unnecessary and would permit investigations with no judicial supervision.

"It's just a grab for more and more power," said Gerald Lefcourt, a past president of the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers. "They want to do things that they know a judge won't approve of."

President Bush is pressing Congress to unshackle law enforcement by adding terrorism to the list of investigations in which administrative subpoenas can be used. They already are used often in health-care fraud, child sex abuse and other cases.

Bush also wants lawmakers to expand the federal death penalty to cover more terror-related offenses and make terror suspects ineligible for release on bond.

The proposals were quickly dubbed "Patriot II" on Capitol Hill, a sequel to the Patriot Act passed shortly after the 2001 terror attacks. That law expanded government surveillance capabilities, toughened criminal penalties and removed a legal barrier that for years prevented information-sharing between intelligence agencies and criminal investigators and prosecutors.

The centerpiece of the new plan is the administrative subpoena. More than 4,000 of these subpoenas were issued by federal prosecutors in 2001, the latest year for which figures are available.

The legislation, introduced by Rep. Tom Feeney, R-Fla., would enable prosecutors to use the administrative subpoena to elicit testimony from witnesses and require a person or business to produce "books, papers, documents, electronic data" or other evidence deemed necessary in a terrorism investigation.

Opponents say the Justice Department already has numerous legal tools to obtain records and compel witnesses to talk, including grand jury subpoenas that are routinely and easily issued by federal prosecutors. The FBI uses **national security letters** to require businesses to turn over a wide range of records in counterterror and counterintelligence investigations. Also available in international terror probes is the **secret Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act warrant**, including an emergency FISA warrant approved personally by the Attorney General, that provides a 72-hour window for wiretapping or eavesdropping before review by a secret court.

Timothy Edgar, legislative counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union, said the administrative subpoena gives the Justice Department "the power to get records from groups or individuals without any court supervision at all. This directly impacts on the privacy of citizens."

Justice officials counter that a business or individual can refuse to comply with an administrative subpoena, which would force prosecutors to convince a judge that the information is needed for an investigation. They also say the subpoenas provide immunity from lawsuits for businesses who would otherwise willingly disclose sensitive information about customers or clients. Grand jury subpoenas often order evidence to be turned over within a specified time. Administrative subpoenas require the evidence to be

produced on the spot. -- AP, Sept. 13, 2003

Leno Speaks

"As you may have heard, the U.S. is putting together a constitution for Iraq. Why don't we just give them ours? Think about it -- it was written by very smart people, it's served us well for over 200 years, and, besides, we're not using it anymore."

-- Tonight Show host Jay Leno

Ashcroft's Flip-flop

By Rep. Ron Paul

Attorney General Ashcroft, enforcer of the Patriot Act, was not always so cavalier about civil liberties. Consider the following statement by then-Senator Ashcroft during the Clinton years:

"The Clinton administration would like the federal government to have the capability to read any international or domestic computer communications. The FBI wants access to decode, digest, and discuss financial transactions, personal e-mail, and proprietary information sent abroad- all in the name of national security.

"The administration's interest in all e-mail is a wholly unhealthy precedent, especially given this administration's track record on FBI files and IRS snooping. Every medium by which people communicate can be subject to exploitation by those with illegal intentions. Nevertheless, this is no reason to hand Big Brother the keys to unlock our e-mail diaries, open our ATM records, read our medical records, or translate our international communications...The implications here are far-reaching, with impacts that touch individual users, companies, libraries, universities, teachers, and students."

The attorney general's blatant flip-flop can of course be ascribed to partisan politics. Like many conservatives, Mr. Ashcroft correctly understood that the Clinton Justice department did not believe in the rule of law and terribly abused its power. Yet even after the Janet Reno debacles, he wants us to believe that his Justice department- and future departments- can be entrusted with more power.

Is Your School's Curriculum UN-Approved?

By Larry Pratt

Does it seem somewhat far out to ask such a question? Would that it were so.

The United States is working with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to federalize the curriculum

of all schools in the United States. The new curriculum would be one that conforms to other countries as well as to UNESCO.

Actually, we do have federal curriculum standards that encompass the teaching of history, geography, social studies and civics. Indeed, there are federal standards for other disciplines as well. The standards are referred to in Washington newspeak as guidelines.

The guidelines have resulted in a subsidized textbook (\$10 a copy) entitled *We, the People: The Citizen and the Constitution*. If a school district does not use this textbook, whatever they teach from must teach to the national tests that reflect the federal "guidelines." The Department of Education is warning states that if they do not have enough students passing the federally approved tests, they will lose their federal subsidies.

The guidelines and *We the People* are so busy teaching multiculturalism and environmentalism that they have no time for teaching the 2nd Amendment (right to keep and bear arms), and the 10th Amendment (severely limiting legitimate activity of the federal government).

And now, it turns out, we are reporting on our progress at wiping out local and state control over curriculum to the UN! Here it is off the UNESCO web site on the USA country report page (www2.unesco.org/wef/countryreports/usa/rapport_2.html):

"Most countries have national curricula.... In the United States, however, education is managed at the state and local levels.... Thus, the very concept of designing and agreeing on a set of learning outcomes across traditional jurisdictional lines is new, and in the minds of many, unsettling and undesirable."

The UN is saying that they are aware of the political sensitivity of a nationalized education system. This explains the following reference to not letting the American voter in on what "us elitists" are pulling off:

"Officials of the U.S. Department of Education, as well as presidents Bush and Clinton, have applauded the emergence of [curriculum] standards at the state level and in the various subject areas, but they understand that any suggestion that these were being imposed by Washington would unleash a political backlash."

And for the pleasure of One World groupies is this gem from the same page:

"Consciousness is thus growing among U.S. educators that... [e]ducational outcomes must now meet not only national but international standards."

I wonder what countries might be the model for setting UN educational standards? Perhaps some of the countries which have trained children to be compliant workers and citizens who do just what they are told. The mind thrills to consider the array of choice: from Cuba to Zimbabwe with Iran and Libya along the way.

Rep. Ron Paul is right. So are the other 73 Representatives who voted with Paul to get the UN out of the US and the US out of the UN.

Being run from Washington is bad enough, but the being run by the UN is the end of the road to perdition.

"Are We Pavlov's Dogs?"

By Charlotte Iserbyt

Who should decide which members of our communities have performed "extraordinary acts of kindness"? Who should define the term "extraordinary acts of kindness"?

Ordinarily, in a free society, these decisions/definitions are left up to the private sector (parents, clergymen, elected officials, or some other individuals not associated with government.)

Once the government is permitted to define "kindness", it's only one step away from defining "bad behavior". My writing this article could easily be considered "bad behavior" because I am criticizing the government.

Do we want the government defining "bad behavior" in our communities without recourse to the courts and the rule of law? We are a people governed and protected by our Constitution and Bill of Rights, not by the use of the police to make arbitrary decisions regarding good or bad behavior.

Our form of government has nothing to do with partnerships between the private sector (citizens) and government. As part of the Bath, Maine community oriented policing system (COPS), police are training volunteer members of the community in "policing"! The *Washington Post*, in an article regarding President Bush's "faith based initiative" (similar to COPS due to its use of federal money and ultimate federal control), referred to the initiative as "communitarianism". Most dictionaries define "communitarianism" as "a communistic form of

government." The COPS program is definitely a "communitarian" initiative.

How far our nation has moving into an "ism" form of government is illustrated by "Extraordinary Acts of Kindness" by Elizabeth Dorsey in *The Times Record*, Brunswick, Maine on January 27, 2003.:

As part of an ongoing effort to forge stronger ties with the community, the Bath and Brunswick police departments will soon start handing out commemorative coins to people who demonstrate extraordinary acts of kindness.

"It will recognize people for helping out with our mission, which is public safety," said Bath Police chief Pete Lizanecz. "It's a way of breaking down the barriers a little bit."

Police officers on patrol in the two communities will carry with them coins embossed with their department's patch. When an officer witnesses someone aiding a fellow citizen or committing a noteworthy act, the officer can award the coin in immediate recognition of the kind deed.

"We need to recognize that the community needs us and we need the community," said Jerry Hinton, chief of the Brunswick Police Department. "That's what community policing is all about."

"What deeds will be rewarded is up to the discretion of the officer. It's all in the heart of the officer and the eyes of the beholder," Hinton said.

The coin program comes out of a partnership between the Maine Community Policing Institute at the University of Maine and seven police departments, including the Maine State Police.

The concept of a commemorative coin has been in existence for decades, especially in military organizations.

After World War II, organizations like the Army Rangers and the Flying Tigers began minting coins for personnel to carry as mementos of military service. The medallions were referred to as 'challenge coins' because veterans would challenge each other to produce them on demand. Someone caught without his coin would owe the other man a beer.

Within the last several years, law enforcement agencies began minting coins as a way to promote the departments and reward citizens.

In Maine, the concept evolved out of the annual meeting of the Maine Chiefs of Police Association. Richard Mears, director of community justice projects at the Institute and a former

deputy chief in Brunswick, formed the coalition in an effort to test the idea.

The idea of recognizing a citizen's role in public safety aligns closely with the philosophy of community policing taught at the Institute and practiced by police across the country.

"It's police and citizens working together at solving community problems," said Laurent F. Gilbert, Sr., the coordinator of the Maine Community Policing Institute. "Crime is a community problem and it needs a community response."

This approach contrasts sharply with the practice of law enforcement in decades past.

"We were trained about 25 to 30 years ago that we should be nailing and jailing people and not correcting the problems as we went along," said Hinton. "(Community policing) is a different paradigm. It's not just black-and-white law."

Funding for the coins was provided in part by the Community Policing Institute and in part by the participating departments.

The departments will keep track of who receives the coins, and the Institute will monitor the success of the program during the next year.

The following response to the above article was published in the 2/4/03 edition of *The Times Record*.

"Are We Pavlov's Dogs?" by Charlotte Thomson Iserbyt

I couldn't believe my eyes when I read the article "Extraordinary Acts of Kindness". Are Americans nothing more nor less than animals to be rewarded like Pavlov's dogs for good deeds? Such a policy of animal training could create a citizenry which will only do good deeds if there is a reward forthcoming.

And, in regard to the criteria for awards, do we really want to leave this decision up to the discretion of the police?

In addition, I am very disturbed by the last paragraph of this article: "The departments will keep track of who receives the coins, and the Institute will monitor the success of the program."

What is the definition of success? Does that mean that the number of coins awarded will reflect success in conditioning citizens to do what the government wants?

In my opinion, the whole community-oriented policing system should be reconsidered. It resembles programs used in totalitarian countries. There are many good policemen in the United States of America who are totally

opposed to and appalled by this program. -- NewsWithViews.com, Feb. 13, 2003

FBI Handling of Informants Condemned

WASHINGTON - While probing organized crime in New England since the 1960s, the FBI used killers as informants, shielded them from prosecution and knowingly sent innocent people to jail, House investigators said after concluding a two-year inquiry.

The bureau's conduct "must be considered one of the greatest failures in the history of federal law enforcement," according to the House Government Reform Committee.

"Federal law enforcement personnel tolerated and probably encouraged false testimony in a state death penalty case just to protect their criminal informants," said Rep. Dan Burton.

"False testimony sent four innocent men to jail. They were made scapegoats in order to shield criminals," said Burton, R-Ind.

The FBI came under criticism for trying to stonewall investigators. Lawmakers complained that the bureau delayed giving them access to audio recordings and logs of conversations involving New England crime boss Raymond Patriarca that provided vital information on the 1965 murder of Edward "Teddy" Deegan.

"The Justice Department made it very difficult for this committee to conduct timely and effective oversight," the report said. "The FBI must improve management of its informant programs to ensure that agents are not corrupted."

Lawmakers are pressing for more House hearings on the FBI's failure to cooperate.

"I would like to continue to investigate why the Justice Department was so recalcitrant in getting us the information. We should not tolerate that kind of behavior," Rep. John Tierney, D-Mass said.

The FBI said in a statement that it has taken "significant steps" to

improve the use of informants, who are vital to many investigations.

A senior FBI official, speaking on condition of anonymity, said some information was withheld or delayed because it related to a court case involving FBI Agent John Connolly Jr., who was convicted last year of protecting his gangster informants.

The report, while broadly condemning the FBI's practices, focuses on the Deegan murder and law enforcement efforts to protect informants, including Jimmy "The Bear" Flemmi and Stephen "The Rifleman" Flemmi

Four men were wrongly convicted of Deegan's murder - two died in prison and two served more than 30 years in prison - all due to what officials concluded was false testimony and the FBI's efforts to protect informants.

Jimmy Flemmi died in prison while serving time for a different murder. Stephen Flemmi recently pleaded guilty to racketeering charges involving 10 murders.

Former FBI agent H. Paul Rico, 78, was arrested near Miami last month on murder charges. He has denied he helped frame innocent men for the Deegan murder. -- AP, Nov. 20, 2003

More Money for the UN

By Reed Irvine and Cliff Kincaid

Libya heads the United Nations Human rights Commission and Iraq is to head a U.N. disarmament panel. Such developments led columnist Charles Krauthammer to say the world body should "rest in peace" and go away. Radio host Sean Hannity said the U.N. didn't deserve another dime. But President Bush's fiscal year 2004 budget proposes an increase in spending on the UN and other international organizations

Official State Department calculations show contributions to international organizations rising to over \$1 billion in fiscal year 2004, as opposed to \$891 million in 2003. In addition to the U.N., international organizations getting more money include the International Cotton Advisory Committee. The cotton group's budget

rises to \$280,000 a year.

The International Rubber Study Group gets \$124,000, and The International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants gets \$166,000.

One highlight of the budget, which was mentioned by the president in his State of the Union address, is \$15 billion spread over five years to fight AIDS, nearly triple the amount we are now giving. The Agency for International Development promotes condoms to fight AIDS and says it has already distributed more than one billion of them worldwide. It even provides them to "sex workers" in brothels.

U.N. peacekeepers, who get a condom-a-day under a program started by Kofi Annan. Ironically, the U.N. started distributing condoms to peacekeepers because of U.S. concern that U.N. forces were spreading AIDS in the very countries they were supposed to protect. This is another U.N. failure that enables it to extract more money from American taxpayers.

Letter to the Editor

Dear NJM,

Here's the new frequency and time of The Intelligence Report. Short wave 9.330 WBCQ The Planet, Tues-Sat. 11am till noon. On Satellite Galaxy 9 transponder wide band audio. Listen live on the Internet on Liberty Tree Radio www.libertytree.radio.4mg.com, www.pbn.4mg.com, www.m2talk.com.

You can write us at liberty@provide.net

Also I have just received my Real Estate license and can refer anyone anywhere to a Realtor and receive a 25% commission (cut from Realtor's commission) for referrals. Please pass on this info. I would rather work for you than ask donations.

God bless you all.

Nancy Koernke
PBN
Box 194
Dexter, MI 48130

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art	(732) 607-0833
Wake Co, NC, Dave	(919) 363-9410
Morris County, Bill	(973) 361-3241
Johnson County, TX, Earl	(817) 866-3288

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State ____ Zip _____

Phone () _____ E-mail _____